



webserver@yucca-web1.ymmp.gov on 05/27/2004 08:41:01 AM

040196

To: EIS.Comments@notes.ymmp.gov
cc:
Subject: EIS Comment

RECEIVED

MAY 27 2004

User Filed as: Not Categorized in ERMS

May 27, 2004 08:41:01

IP address: [REDACTED]

The Commentors Name:
----> Marliss A Rogers

The Commentors Address:
----> [REDACTED]
----> [REDACTED]

Email Information:
----> [REDACTED]

----> Add commentor to the mailing list : no

Contact Information:

----> fax number :
----> phone number :
----> organization :
----> position :

Comment Text :

-->I deplore DOE's decision to use “mostly rail” shipments to haul 77,000 tons of highly radioactive wastes to its proposed national dumpsite at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and to build a rail line from Caliente, NV to provide direct rail access for waste shipments to Yucca Mountain. This decision has vast implications for all U.S. citizens. I believe that the DOE has not adequately assessed or analyzed the national impacts of its decisions, nor has it allowed enough time for people to respond -- the 52 day comment period includes the Memorial Day holiday weekend! How are concerned citizens across the U.S. supposed to be able to figure out the impact of DOE's announcements on their communities and submit comments in just 52 days, when DOE has not performed adequate national assessments in the past two decades? At least 180 days should be allowed for public comment.

DOE should also hold public hearings to gather comments in those states and cities most affected. All comments received should be transcribed and posted immediately to the DOE's website to enhance public participation and interaction. Hearings should be conducted so that speakers go one at a time, so that all present can hear what is being said. If this means that longer hearings or multiple days of hearings must be held in the same city to accommodate meaningful public involvement, then so be it. What is DOE's rush? DOE is putting the cart before the horse on high-level radioactive waste transportation route decisions within Nevada. Not only is this illogical, it also violates the legal requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

1

040196

Please rethink this decisions. Thank you.
